Docket No.: 03042/100G691-US2

Application No.: 09/603,601

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 14, 23 - 40, 51, 52 and 57 - 60 are currently pending, claims 15 - 22 having been earlier withdrawn and claims 41 - 50 and 53 - 56 having earlier been canceled. In the present amendment, Applicant cancels claims 11, 52 and 57 - 60 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amends claims 1, 2, 4, 7 - 10, 12 - 14, 23, 28, 29 and 35. No new matter is added. Support for these claims may be found in the specification, for example, at page 9, line 25 through page 13, line 29 and page 19, line 13 through page 24, line 18.

A final Office Action was mailed on May 13, 2005. Claims 1 - 13, 29 - 40, 51, 52 and 57 - 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,039,688 to Douglas et al. in view of U.S. Patent no. 5,880,731 to Liles et al. Claims 14 and 23 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Douglas in view of Liles and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0088461 to Christensen. Claims 28 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Douglas in view of Liles and U.S. Patent No. 6,658,457 to Rice et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In amended independent claim 1, Applicant discloses:

1. A method for funding an interactive network site hosted on a server, comprising the steps of:

providing a question and answer forum on the network site for access by a plurality of users and a plurality of experts, the forum having a topic;

receiving first and second questions generated by one or more of the plurality of users, wherein the first question identifies a first expert chosen to answer the first question, and the second question identifies identifies a second expert chosen to answer the second question or identifies no chosen expert to answer the second question;

routing the first question to the first chosen expert, wherein the first question may be selectively displayed on a personal expert interface of the first chosen expert in a grouping of questions identified as being directed to the first chosen expert;

routing the second question to the second chosen expert when the second chosen question is identified, wherein the second question may be selectively displayed on a

personal expert interface of the second chosen expert in a grouping of questions identified as being directed to the second chosen expert;

posting the second question when no chosen expert is identified in a location on the server that is accessible to the plurality of experts; and

receiving a payment, from a third party associated with a third party product or service, for access to the network site by one or more of the plurality of users.

Douglas discloses a therapeutic behavior modification program which features an electronic meeting room. In this meeting room, for example, participants are able to listen to or read the remarks of a selected speaker, and engage in discussions among the members of the meeting in response to the speaker's remarks. However, in sharp contrast to Applicant's claimed method, the participants in Douglas' program are unable to submit a question in such a manner that it may be selectively routed either directly to a chosen expert for an answer, or alternatively to a location on a server such that it may be retrieved and answered by a plurality of experts, based on whether or not a chosen expert is designated.

This deficiency is not overcome by the addition of the Liles reference. Liles discloses a system for conducting a chat system that supports the use of avatars that may be animated by participants to convey selected personality traits. Liles arguably suggests that participants in the chat session may engage in communications by means of questions and answers, and discloses that a participant may control his or her session to limit communications to participants represented by a selected group of avatars. However, in sharp contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Lisles fails to suggest in addition that the questions may be selectively routed to individual participants in a plurality of participants, and that each question routed to a particular participant is routed to a personal expert interface that presents the question in a grouping of questions identified as being specifically selected to be answered by the chosen participant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is not made obvious by the combination of Douglas and Lisles and is in condition for allowance. As independent claims 7, 12, 28 and 29 have been amended to include similar limitations to amended claim 1 with regard to questions routed to a personal expert interface of a chosen expert, Applicant

substantially repeats his arguments with respect to amended independent claim 1 for application to amended independent claims 12, 28 and 29, and further submits that claims 12, 28 and 29 are therefore in condition for allowance. As dependent claims 2 - 7, 13, 14 30 - 34 each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 7, 12, 28 and 29, Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2 - 7, 13, 14 30 - 34 are allowable for at least this reason.

In amended independent claim 8, Applicant discloses:

8. A method for funding an interactive network site, comprising the steps of:

providing a question and answer forum on the network site for access by at least one user and at least one expert, the forum having a topic;

receiving a question generated by a user during the forum and providing the user generated question to the expert; and

receiving a payment for the provision of the forum from a third party associated with a product or service independent of the network site, wherein the user is a consumer of the product or service;

wherein the payment represents a benefit provided to the user by the third party having a value that is related to the user's consumption of the service or product.

Douglas arguably suggests that payments may be made by a third party in support of a therapeutic behavior modification program for a user at an interactive site (e.g., FIG. 54). However, in sharp contrast to Applicant's method as claimed in amended independent claim 8, Douglas nowhere discloses or suggests that such payments are made in relation to a <u>user's consumption</u> of a service or product provided by that third party, where the service or product consumed is <u>independent</u> of any product or service being provided by the network site. As Liles nowhere addresses funding for its disclosed chat system, this deficiency of Douglas cannot be overcome with the addition of Liles. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 8 is not made obvious by the combination of Douglas and Lisles and is in condition for allowance. As dependent claims 9, 10 and 23 - 27 each depend from allowable claim 8, Applicant further submits that dependent claims 9, 10 and 23 - 27 are allowable for at least this reason.

In amended independent claim 35, Applicant discloses:

Application No.: 09/603,601

14

35. A method for funding a plurality of interactive network sites, comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of question and answer for afor access by at least one user and at least one expert, each of the fora being generated at least one of the plurality of interactive network sites;

receiving a question from a user accessing the forum of one of said plural interactive network sites;

identifying an expert chosen to answer the received question;

routing the question to the chosen expert;

receiving a response by the expert to the question, and a command signal selectively identifying at least one of the plurality of fora at which to post the response;

posting the response generated by the expert at the identified for based on the command signal; and

receiving a payment from a third party associated with at least one of the fora posting the response.

In the Office Action of May 13, 205, the Examiner suggests that Douglas discloses multiple, referencing Douglas' "meeting room" (e.g., FIG. 14) and "coffee shop" (e.g., FIG. 15), and further suggests that the use of multiple network sites to support multiple fora is well-known in the art. However, in sharp contrast to Applicant's invention as claimed in amended independent claim 35, neither Douglas nor Liles, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that a command signal be received together with the response to a question, and cause that response to be selectively posted at one or more identified fora based on the command signal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 35 is not made obvious by the combination of Douglas and Lisles and is in condition for allowance. As dependent claims 36 - 40 and 51 each depend from allowable claim 35, Applicant further submits that dependent claims 36 - 40 and 51 are allowable for at least this reason.

Applicant requests that this amendment be entered, respectfully submits that the application is thereby placed in condition for allowance, and requests that the application be allowed.

Docket No.: 03042/100G691-US2

Application No.: 09/603,601

Docket No.: 0304

Should the Examiner have any questions, he or she is invited to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

15

Dated: November 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Bean

Registration No.: 44,528 DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant